

JUN 17 1981

DISTRIBUTION  
DOCKET FILE

bcc: TERA/NSIC/TIC  
ACPS (16)

Docket Nos.: 50-413  
and 50-414

Mr. William O. Parker  
Vice President - Steam Production  
Duke Power Company  
P.O. Box 33189  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

LB#4 Rdg  
DEisenhut  
EAdensam  
KJabbour  
JLee  
SHanauer  
RTedesco  
RVollmer  
TMurley  
RMattson  
RHartfield, MPA  
OELD  
OIE (3)  
L/PDR  
NRC/PDR



Dear Mr. Parker:

Subject: Staff Evaluation of Item I.C.1 for Westinghouse Facilities

We have completed our interim review of the Westinghouse Owners Group submittal for Action Plan item I.C.1, Guidance for the Evaluation and Development of Procedures for Transients and Accidents. A copy of Mr. Eisenhut's May 28, 1981 letter to Mr. Jurgensen, Chairman, Westinghouse Owners Group is enclosed for your information. As indicated in the enclosure, further work will be necessary in order to produce a document which satisfies the staff positions in a timely matter.

Sincerely,

Elinor G. Adensam, Acting Chief  
Licensing Branch No. 4  
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:  
As stated

cc: See next page

8107060044 810617  
PDR ADOCK 05000413  
A PDR

OFFICE	DL:LB#4	DL:LB#4	DL:AD/L				
SURNAME	KJabbour:eb	EAdensam	RTedesco				
DATE	6/16/81	6/16/81	6/16/81				

CATAUNDA

Mr. William O. Parker  
Vice President - Steam Production  
Duke Power Company  
P.O. Box 33189  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

cc: William L. Porter, Esq.  
Duke Power Company  
P.O. Box 33189  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

J. Michael McGarry, III, Esq.  
Debevoise & Liberman  
1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

North Carolina MPA-1  
P.O. Box 95162  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27625

Mr. R. S. Howard  
Power Systems Division  
Westinghouse Electric Corp.  
P.O. Box 355  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

Mr. J. C. Plunkett, Jr.  
NUS Corporation  
2536 Countryside Boulevard  
Clearwater, Florida 33515

Mr. Jesse L. Riley, President  
Carolina Environmental Study Group  
854 Henley Place  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28208

Richard P. Wilson, Esq.  
Assistant Attorney General  
S.C. Attorney General's Office  
P.O. Box 11549  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Walton J. McLeod, Jr., Esq.  
General Counsel  
South Carolina State Board of Health  
J. Marion Sims Building  
2600 Bull Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

North Carolina Electric Membership  
Corp.  
333 North Boulevard  
P.O. Box 27306  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Saluda River Electric Cooperative,  
Inc.  
207 Sherwood Drive  
Laurens, South Carolina 29360

James W. Burch, Director  
Nuclear Advisory Counsel  
2600 Bull Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Mr. Peter K. VanDoorn  
Resident Inspector  
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
P.O. Box 11695  
Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
825 North Capital Street, N.E.  
Washington, D. C. 20426

Chairman  
South Carolina Public Service  
Commission  
P.O. Box 11649  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

MAY 28 1981

Robert W. Jurgensen, Chairman  
Westinghouse Owners Group  
American Electric Power Service  
Corporation  
2 Broadway  
New York, New York 10004

Dear Mr. Jurgensen:

In your letter dated March 18, 1981 (06-54), you summarized a meeting held on February 20, 1981 between representatives of the NRC staff, Westinghouse Owners, and Westinghouse Electric Corporation. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG) activities in response to NUREG-0737, Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements, Item I.C.1, Guidance for the Evaluation and Development of Procedures for Transients and Accidents. Following the meeting summary, you requested that the staff acknowledge the acceptability of the program described in the meeting.

As indicated in a meeting with Tom Anderson, of Westinghouse, on April 8, 1981, we have concerns about the acceptability of the WOG program. The last submittal of generic WOG guidelines, including the Inadequate Core Cooling Guidelines, required the operator to diagnose a specific event using the diagnostic procedure included in the guidelines. Subsequent failures were, essentially, addressed by entry into one of the inadequate core cooling guidelines. As indicated in the February meeting and discussed in your letter, the guidelines do not provide smooth transitions from the event procedures to direct the operator if subsequent multiple or consequential failures occur. This leaves the operator with no guidance until entry conditions for the Inadequate Core Cooling Guidelines are reached. Furthermore, the guidelines do not address subsequent reevaluation of plant conditions to ensure that the expected plant response is occurring.

Our second concern is your proposed schedule for completing the program recognizing that development of emergency operating procedures is a dynamic process with no absolute end point. However, we are concerned that continual, major rewriting of emergency operating procedures is a burden on plant operating staffs and confusing to the operators who must relearn the procedures. In the February meeting, WOG representatives indicated that they expect to have the initial development phase of the guidelines completed in July 1981, and would not expect major changes to the guidelines to result from the phases to be completed in January 1982 and July 1982. You also state in your letter that the initial phase will address over 98 percent of the total risk. However, we were also told in the meeting that the guidelines to be submitted in July would probably not differ greatly from those already submitted. Considering our concerns with the existing guidelines, as addressed above, we do not see how the July submittal can be responsive to NUREG-0737, Item I.C.1 without significant change. We believe that additional work is necessary. *dup of*

# 8106170284

DUPLICATE


MAY 28 1981

The staff has not completed its review of WCAP 9691 or the probability estimates presented in the February meeting, and the Owners Group has not addressed the broad range of initiating events, including natural phenomena such as earthquakes, in the analysis presented to date. Therefore, we cannot assess the overall adequacy of the proposed program. Unless our concerns, as stated herein, are satisfied, the ability of licensees to meet the schedule for revising their procedures may be compromised.

As indicated in the April 8, 1981 meeting, we have serious doubts that the full range of initiating events and subsequent failures can be addressed within the event specific framework adopted by the Westinghouse Owners Group. If your additional work to date provides more insight into resolution of these concerns, we would be available to meet with you at your convenience.

By copy of this letter, each licensee and applicant of a Westinghouse-type plant, is being advised of our evaluation of your submittal.

Sincerely,

  
Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director  
Division of Licensing

cc: E. Murphy  
W Licensees  
W Applicants